REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant Amendment, claims 1-20 will be pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 15, 17 and 20 will have been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is provided in at least Fig. 1. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,647,373 to CARLTON-FOSS.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every element as set forth in the subject claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established because CARLTON-FOSS fails to teach each and every element of the claims.

More particularly, amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia,*

one or more weight generator modules which receives the one or more objects having two or more attributes and one or more objects ranked by one or more users, and computes one or more weights of the two or more attributes; and one or more multi-criteria decision analysis module which receives the one or more objects having two or more attributes and one or more weights of the two or more attributes from the one or more weight generator modules, and computes one or more scores of the one or more objects.

Additionally, amended independent claims 15 and 20 recite, *inter alia,*

7

computing one or more weights of the two or more attributes by using one or more ranks specified for the selected objects;

displaying one or more views of the one or more objects having two or more attributes with one or more scores for individual objects in the one or more visual interfaces; and

displaying one or more weights of the two or more attributes in the one or more visual interfaces.

Applicants submit that CARLTON-FOSS does not disclose or even suggest at least these features. Applicants acknowledges that CARLTON-FOSS discloses a system for conducting a reverse auction in an electronic environment (see Abstract). Applicants also acknowledge that CARLTON-FOSS discloses that the system uses a bid ranking manger 134 and calculates and displays information from associated bids (see col. 10, lines 57-65). Finally, Applicants acknowledge that the bid ranking manager 134 appears to use as an input "purchaser-assigned weighting representing the importance of each evaluation dimension" (see col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 5). However, Applicants submit that the disclosed bid ranking manager 134 is not a multi-criteria decisional analysis module, much less, one which receives the one or more objects having two or more attributes and one or more weights of the two or more attributes from the one or more weight generator modules, and computes one or more scores of the one or more objects. Moreover, even assuming that the Examiner could properly characterize the device 134 as such a module (which Applicants cannot envision being the case), the Examiner failed to identify any other device in CARLTON-FOSS which could constitute a weight generator module that sends the one or more objects having two or more attributes and one or more weights of the two or more attributes to the one or more weight generator modules.

Applicants emphasize that while the system of CARLTON-FOSS is capable of computing scores for objects such as bids (see bottom of Fig. 12b) and receives as inputs attributes having weights (see middle of Fig. 12b), the disclosed system apparently receives the weights from a purchaser (see col. 11, line 3), and does not appear to compute one or more weights of the two or more attributes as recited in each of claims 1, .15 and 20.

Furthermore, while it is apparent from Fig. 15 of CARLTON-FOSS that the system is capable of displaying a view having bids that are ranked (see middle of Fig. 15) and another view with the details of a particular bid (see bottom of Fig. 15), the disclosed system does not appear to be capable of displaying one or more views of the one or more objects having two or more attributes with one or more scores for individual objects in the one or more visual interfaces and displaying one or more weights of the two or more attributes. To the contrary, the bottom screen shown in Fig. 15 does not display any weights whatsoever.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 15 and 20, and claims 2-6, 9-13 and 16-19, which depend from claims 1 and 15 are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above-noted rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 7, 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being allegedly unpatentable over CARLTON-FOSS alone. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner acknowledges that CARLTON-FOSS fails to disclose, among other things, the one or more parallel coordinates and the recited score inequality. However, the Examiner explains, without citing any prior art, that such features would have been obvious. Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established as the applied references fail to teach each and every element of the claims.

Applicants submits that CARLTON-FOSS fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in at least independent claim 1. Applicants also submit that no proper modification of CARLTON-FOSS discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in at least claim 1.

As explained above, CARLTON-FOSS lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to a multi-criteria decisional analysis module, much less, one which receives the one or more objects having two or more attributes and one or more weights of the two or more attributes from the one or more weight generator modules, and computes one or more scores of the one or more objects. Moreover, even assuming that the Examiner could properly characterize the device 134 as such a module, the Examiner failed to identify any other device in CARLTON-FOSS which could constitute a weight generator module that sends the one or more objects having two or more attributes and one or more weights of the two or more attributes to the one or more weight generator modules. Finally, it is clear that while the system of CARLTON-FOSS is capable of computing scores for objects such as bids (see bottom of Fig. 12b) and receives as inputs attributes having weights (see middle of Fig. 12b), the disclosed system

apparently receives the weights from a purchaser (see col. 11, line 3), and does not

compute one or more weights of the two or more attributes as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in addition to failing to disclose the combination of features recited in

the above-noted claim 1, Applicants submit no proper modification of CARLTON-FOSS

discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in dependent claims 7, 8 and

14, which also respectfully contain all of the features of claim 1.

Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner relies upon official notice in support

of the instant rejection, Applicants remind the Examiner that MPEP 2144.03 specifically

explains that "[o]fficial notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be

taken by the examiner where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common

knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being

well-known." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner produce

documentary evidence to support the Examiner's assertions to the extent that the

Examiner is relying on official notice.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-noted rejection under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of

the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for

allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to

issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number

listed below, if needed. Any fees required for consideration of the instant response are

hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,
Juhnyoung LEE et al.

Andrew M. Calderon
Reg. No. 38,093

December 21, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
703-716-1191